

REPLY TO OFFICE ACTION DATED DECEMBER 20, 2005
SERIAL NO: 09/834,325

DOCKET NO: 199-0044US

REMARKS

Claims 1-15, and 24-33 are pending and were rejected. No claims are amended, and thus claims 1-15 and 24-33 remain pending.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11, 13-15 and 24-25

Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11, 13-15 and 24-25 stand rejected under § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. 2001/0042114A1 to Agrapharam (“Agrapharam”). Claims 1 and 24 are independent claims. The other listed claims depend, either directly or indirectly, from one of these two claims. Because independent claims 1 and 24 are allowable over the cited art, it is not necessary to address the rejections of the dependent claims. Therefore, the following remarks focus on independent claims 1 and 24.

For Agrapharam to anticipate claims 1 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), two requirements must be met. First, Agrapharam must disclose each and every element as set forth in Applicants' claims. MPEP § 2131. Second, Agrapharam must enable Applicants' claims. *Elan Pharm., Inc. v. Mayo Found. For Med. Educ. & Research*, 346 F.3d 1051, 1054, 68 USPQ2d 1373, 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2003). Agrapharam does not meet either requirement and therefore does not anticipate Applicants' claims. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims is therefore requested.

Agrapharam Does Not Disclose Each Element of the Claims

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner states on page 2 of the Office Action:

Regarding claim 1, Agrapharam discloses a video conferencing system comprising a main unit, the main unit (40, fig. 4), including a device interface in (40, fig. 4), a camera adapter in (40, fig. 4), a docking station adapter in (48, fig. 4), a processor (43, fig. 4), and memory in (40, fig. 4), the device interface including one or more ports adapted to provide an output to a device or receive input from a device, the processor and memory configured to perform video conferencing functions, the

REPLY TO OFFICE ACTION DATED DECEMBER 20, 2005
SERIAL NO: 09/834,325

DOCKET NO: 199-0044US

camera adapter configured to removably receive a camera (46/47, fig. 4) unit that provides audio and video signals to the main unit through the camera adapter, the processor of the main unit programmed to process the audio signals and in response to the audio signals to generate control signals to control at least one of the direction or zoom of the camera, and the docking station adapter configured to removably couple to a docking station (reads on 48, fig. 4) that connects in a communicating relationship with video conferencing network (10, fig. 1; paragraphs 0034-0035, 0028-0029).

The Office Action states on page 2 that Agraaharam discloses a video conferencing system comprising:

a main unit, the main unit (40, fig. 4), including . . . a docking station adapter in (48, fig. 4) . . . the docking station adapter configured to removably couple to a docking station (reads on 48, fig. 4) that connects in a communicating relationship with video conferencing [sic] network (10, fig. 1)

What Agraaharam, at Figure 4, reference numeral 48 of Agraaharam, in fact, discloses is "LAN connectors." Figure 4, reference numeral 40 of Agraaharam, in fact, discloses "a computer." The "computer" 40 of Agraaharam does not include "LAN connectors" 48 of Agraaharam, as shown in Figure 4 of Agraaharam, because "LAN connectors" 48 of Agraaharam are not connected to the "computer" 40. Thus, even if "computer" 40 constitutes the "main unit" element of claims 1 and 24, as the Examiner contends and which the Applicants do not concede, the "LAN connectors" of Agraaharam are not included in the "main unit" of Agraaharam.

As no explanation of LAN connector is provided in Agraaharam, the ordinary meaning must be employed. A LAN connector, in common parlance, is nothing more than a jack terminating a cable. A cable is not a docking station. The "LAN connectors" of Agraaharam, therefore, are not configured to removably couple to a docking station as a "docking station" is disclosed in the present application, as a "docking station" is known in the art, or even according to the plain-language meaning of "docking station."

The "LAN connectors" of Agraaharam, therefore, do not disclose the docking station adapter configured to removably couple to a docking station that connects the main unit in a communicating relationship with a videoconferencing network required by claims 1 and 24. Because Agraaharam does not teach each and every element of claim 1, Agraaharam does not anticipate claim 1 of the present application under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

REPLY TO OFFICE ACTION DATED DECEMBER 20, 2005
SERIAL NO: 09/834,325

DOCKET NO: 199-0044US

For the above reasons, all the elements of claim 1 are not disclosed by AgraHaram. Therefore, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C § 102(e) as being anticipated by AgraHaram is improper. Claim 1 is allowable and its allowance is requested. Independent claim 24 has at least the same limitations regarding the “main unit,” so it is allowable for the same reasons. Dependent claims 2, 4-9, 11, and 13-15, and 25 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 1; therefore they are all allowable and their allowance is requested.

AgraHaram Does Not Enable Applicants' Claims

To anticipate Applicants' claims under 35 U.S.C § 102(e), AgraHaram must enable Applicants' claims. Claim 1 is directed to a video conferencing system that includes, among other things, a “*docking station adapter configured to removably couple to a docking station*” that connects the main unit in a communicating relationship with a video conferencing network.” Claim 24 includes a substantially identical limitation. In contrast, AgraHaram is drawn to a typical prior art video conferencing system. AgraHaram lacks any teaching or suggestion of the required docking station adapter configured to removably couple to a docking station. No docking station is mentioned in the written specification of AgraHaram, and no figure of AgraHaram, including Figure 4, depicts a docking station. As such, AgraHaram cannot enable claim 1 or claim 24 of the present application. Because AgraHaram does not enable claim 1 or claim 24 of the present application, AgraHaram cannot anticipate the Applicants' claims under 35 U.S.C § 102(e). Dependent claims 2, 4-9, 11, 13-15 and 25 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 1; therefore they are all allowable and their allowance is requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3, 10, 12, and 26-33

The Examiner has the burden to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. MPEP § 2142. One criteria necessary to the establishment of a prima facie case of obviousness is that the prior art references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *Id.* Applicant respectfully submits that the combinations proposed by the Examiner each fail to teach or suggest each limitation of claims 1 and 24. Thus, the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims is therefore requested.

REPLY TO OFFICE ACTION DATED DECEMBER 20, 2005
SERIAL NO: 09/834,325

DOCKET NO: 199-0044US

Claims 3, 10, 12, and 26-33 stand rejected in the Office Action under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agraharam in view of various other references. As shown above, the primary reference Agraharam does not disclose elements of independent claims 1 and 24 for which it is cited, namely a “docking station adapter configured to removably couple to a docking station that connects the main unit in a communicating relationship with a video conferencing network” (“docking station”). Each secondary reference lacks the “docking station” element of claims 1 and 24. Claims 3, 10, 12, and 26-33 depend from either claim 1 or claim 24, and therefore incorporate the limitations of one of these independent claims. Individually and in their combination, therefore, the proposed references do not teach at least one of the elements in each of claims 3, 10, 12, and 26-33 (the “docking station” element). Since the combination does not teach all claim limitations in the claimed invention, the obviousness rejection based on such combination is improper. MPEP § 2143. Therefore, claims 3, 10, 12, and 26-33 are allowable, and the allowance of these claims is requested.

REPLY TO OFFICE ACTION DATED DECEMBER 20, 2005
SERIAL NO: 09/834,325

DOCKET NO: 199-0044US

CONCLUSION

Reconsideration of the pending claims in light of the above remarks and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested. If, after considering this reply, the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would be beneficial towards advancing this case to allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the number listed.

3-20-2006

Date

T. Austin Crone

T. Austin Crone

Reg. No. 56,335

Wong, Cabello, Lutsch, Rutherford & Brucculeri, L.L.P.

20333 State Highway 249, Suite 600

Houston, Texas 77070

Voice: 832-446-2407

Facsimile: 832-446-2424